United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,516	02/11/2002	Gregory M. Shreve	KSU .P. 222	5308

			EXAMINER
21324	7590	10/13/2005	PIERRE, MYRIAM

HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP
One GOJO Plaza
Suite 300
AKRON, OH 44311-1076

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-60* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-60* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 11 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because

a multiple dependent on claims 5 or 10. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claim 5

has not been further treated on the merits. Examiner reads Claim 11 as depending on

claim 10.

2.   Claims 39-46 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate

of claims 31-38. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close

in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it

is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate

of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-3, 18-27, 29-38, 48-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Fritz et al. (6,134,552).

As to claim 1, Fritz et al. teach a method of document management utilizing

document corpora comprising:

gathering a source corpus of documents in electronic form (Fig. 1 elements 104

and 106);

modeling the source corpus in terms of document and domain structure

information to identify corpus enhancement parameters (Fig. 3 element 306 is an

enhancement of element 304);

using a meta-language (Fig. 3 element 304, "language" and "version" and

"attributes") to electronically tag the source corpus (meta-information is language

captured from editor with which object was created or generated by the information

repository, Fig. 3 element 306 and col. 6 lines 16-20, logical objects contains language

descriptions of all the documents);

programming the corpus enhancement parameters (three tiered IR, information

repository, content model) into an intelligent agent (IR document management

agent/system, Fig. 1 element 108) (col. 6 lines 42-55; the three tiered IR content model

has meta-information or attributes such as format and language, the three tiered IR

content model is intrinsic or inherent in the IR document management system, thus, the

three tiered content info is a system which is programmed to be the intelligent agent);

using the intelligent agent (IR document management system) to search external

repositories to find similar terms and structures (Fig. 14 element 1408), and return them

to the source corpora, whereby the source corpus is enhanced to form a uni-corpus

(col. 6 lines 66-67; col. 7 lines 1-4 and 6 lines 42-55; the source corpus example is "IR

Report v4.0", the uni-corpus are each files, each deriving from another file ending in the

source corpus, in which one is in HTTP format (external repositories), all four files are one uni-corpus and are derived from the source corpus which is 304).

At to claim 2, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 1 upon which claim 2 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

replicating the uni-corpus in at least one language other than the language of the uni-corpus (Fig. 3 element 306 is a copy of uni-corpus 304).

At to claim 3, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 2 upon which claim 3 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

uni-corpus replication includes translating terms in the uni-corpus with a machine dictionary (Fig. 1a.1 Info Repository, IR web server) (col. 6 lines 54-57 and Fig. 1a.2 element 132 and Fig. 4; the IR document management system does the translation, which inherently is part of a machine/computer, thus a machine dictionary is used to translate words from one language to the next).

At to claim 18, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 1 upon which claim 18 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

providing access to the uni-corpus over a peer-to-peer network (Fig. 1 element 102 is inherent peer-to-peer, col. 5 lines 15-26 and lines 51-63 and col. 4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 19, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 18 upon which claim

19 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

two uni-corpora are connected via the peer-to-peer network, such that sharing of

resources occurs between the uni-corpora (Fig. 1 element 102 and 108 files are shared,

and col. 5 lines 50-63 and col. 4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 20, Fritz et al. teach a global documentation method comprising:

providing the search parameters to an intelligent agent (Fig. 5 "content attribute"

has parameters such as language and format);

enhancing the source corpus by accessing resources outside (Fig. 1a.a element

146 and 148) of the source corpus with the intelligent agent (Fig. 1a.1, source corpus is

in the database accessed via the IR content and Management Agent),

where said intelligent tags the modeled source corpus and retrieves resources

according to the search parameters to create a first uni-corpus of tagged documents

(Fig. 3, tags are "attributes" in elements 304, 306, 308, and 310);

replicating the first uni-corpus (Fig. 3 elements 304) in at least one other

language (element 306) to form a second uni-corpus (Fig. 3 element 310); and

selectively mining at least one uni-corpus to perform a selected task (Fig. 4 and

col. 8 lines 18-40; data mining via translation from reference document to "content"

version and "content" change).

At to claim 21, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 20 upon which claim

21 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

providing access to the uni-corpus via a shared network (Fig. 1 element 102 and

108 files are shared, and col. 5 lines 50-63).

At to claim 22, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 21 upon which claim

22 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

shared network is a peer-to-peer network (Fig. 1 elements 102 & 108 are

inherent peer-to-peer, col. 5 lines 15-26 and lines 51-63 and col. 5 lines 50-63 and col.

4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 23, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 21 upon which claim

23 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

inherent routing documents between uni-corpora (Fig. 3 element 304) connected

on the peer-to-peer network to a user (Fig. 1 elements 102 and 108 and col. 4 lines 37-

40).

At to claim 24, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 23 upon which claim

24 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

tracking the routing of the documents (Fig. 10.1 and Fig. 10.3 col. 8 lines 55-67;

user is allowed to view or track the content category which has the routing/order of the

documents).

At to claim 25, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 24 upon which claim

25 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

managing rights (checkout/check-in) to the documents (content access agent)

routed across the peer-to-peer network (Fig. 1 elements 102 and 108) (content access

agent, check out or check in of documents, col. 13 lines 34-37 and col. 7 lines 46-66

and col. 4 lines 37-40; IR checks status to ensure that document is not yet checked in

and not currently checked out, network is inherently in Fig. 1 elements 102 and 108).

At to claim 26, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 20 upon which claim

26 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the first uni-corpus has a plurality of terms wherein replicating includes pre-

populating the second uni-corpus (Fig. 3; pre-populating via tagging) by using machine

translations of at least a portion of said first uni-corpus terms (col. 6 lines 54-57 and Fig.

1a.2 element 132 and Fig. 4; the IR document management system does the

translation, which inherently has a machine dictionary via a server to translate words

from one language to the next, thus a machine translation).

At to claim 27, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 26 upon which claim

27 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

analyzing the machine translated terms to define remaining terms in the first uni-

corpus (Fig. 4 document collection, content change for language translation, machine

translation terms are pre-populated via analysis and Fig. 23.3 "update registry and

update file properties").

At to claim 29, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 27 upon which claim

29 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

analyzing includes performing a natural language analysis of the first uni-corpus

terms (col. 6 lines 17-24; col. 8 lines 55-67 and Fig. 4; content category would inherently

perform natural language analysis in order to find out the proper category to place each

document or file).

At to claim 30, Fritz et al. teach a document management method comprising:

constructing models of a source corpus of documents (Fig. 3 element 306 is a

model of element 304);

deriving parameters from said models for the operation of an intelligent agent

(information objects, physical or logical) over at least one external document repository

(IR) (Figs. 1 and 3, external document via element 108 and col. 8 lines 18-20 and Fig.

9);

enhancing the source corpus of documents by adding selected documents

retrieved by the intelligent agent to form an artificially enhanced corpus (adding

component via Fig. 1 element 102 and col. 6 lines 24-37).

At to claim 31, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 30 upon which claim

31 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

analyzing the artificially enhanced corpus to discover objects useful for at least one task (Fig. 22 element 2212, col. 13 lines 18-22; Fig. 3, task can be storing names for each logical object);

tagging the objects (Fig. 3, tags are "attributes") within the artificially enhanced corpus to allow for identification ("PH_2" Fig. 3 element 306), description (language=E, Fig. 3 element 306), and retrieval of the objects (Fig. 1 element 104, logical object properties, stored) (col. 13 lines 17-21).

At to claim 32, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 30 upon which claim 32 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

replicating the artificially enhanced corpus in a second language (Fig. 3 translation from element 304 to 306).

At to claim 33, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 32 upon which claim 33 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

performing cross-linguistic alignment of the second language artificially enhanced corpus and the first artificially enhanced corpus and tagging objects within the corpora according to the alignment (Fig. 3 elements 304 and 306, translation document is tagged and cross-linguistic alignment is inherently performed via the translation and linking process).

At to claim 34, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 33 upon which claim 34 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

pre-populating terminology management and translation memory management components of a computer-assisted translation workstation with the objects tagged in the second language artificially enhanced corpus (Fig. 3 elements 304 and 306; col. 6 lines 24-37; re-populating terminology management is via the translation process and tagging of second language is in Fig. 3 element 306).

At to claim 35, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 30 upon which claim 35 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

linking the artificially enhanced corpora (Fig. 1 element 104) to at least one other artificially enhanced corpus (Fig. 1 element 102) using a peer-to-peer network (col. 4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 36, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 35 upon which claim 36 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the intelligent agent adds documents (document edition, Fig. 1 element 102) to the artificially enhanced corpus from another artificially enhanced corpus (Fig. 1a.2 and col. 5 lines 43-49) located on the peer-to-peer network (col. 4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 37, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 30 upon which claim 37 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the external document repository (Fig. 1 element 102 and 104) includes the
internet (www) (col. 4 lines 37-40).

At to claim 38, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 30 upon which claim
38 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the external document repository (Fig. 1 element 108, Information Repository)
includes other corpora resident (Fig. 1 element 104, viewer application) on a peer-to-
peer network (Fig. 1; col. 4 lines 37-40).

As to claim 48 Fritz et al. teach a document management system, in which a
document manager is linked to a plurality of unicorpora via a peer-to-peer network, the
document management system including a method of providing document management
services including authoring and translation comprising:

receiving a document management request from a uni-corpora in the network
(Fig. 1 element 104 and Fig. 3);

programming an intelligent agent with a set of parameters responsive to the
request (Fig. 2, programming done thru parameters such as physical object and
language format and component, elements 204, 206 and 208);

deploying the intelligent agent to search uni-corpora in the peer-to-peer network
to identify objects responsive to the request (Fig. 1 and col. 5 lines 14-26); and

transmitting the objects to the requesting uni-corpus by way of the peer-to-peer
network (Fig. 1 and col. 5 lines 14-26).

As to claim 49 Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 48 upon which claim 49 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

assembling the identified objects according to the parameters into a document (Fig. 13, "Hyperlink Reference" is attached to the document, via the parameters from the Tag ID, element 1312)

As to claim 50, Fritz et al. teach an intelligent agent in a document management method comprising:

a program containing parameters derived from heuristic models of a source corpus (Fig. 3 element 302 and Fig. 18 element 1902, language version and language content parameters);

wherein said parameters are implemented in said program to locate and retrieve documents from external document repositories (Fig. 1 element 102 and col. 5 lines 14-26).

As to claim 51, Fritz et al. teach an intelligent agent used in a document management method comprising:

an inherent program including a tagging subroutine operating under parameters (Fig. 3 elements 304 and 306 and col. 5 lines 39-50; subroutine Physical Object is tagged "Attributes" such as "ID" "language" and "content"),

said parameters causing the program to search a corpus and directing the

tagging subroutine to tag language objects within the corporus (Fig. 3 element 304 and

306; language is tagged "D" and "E" respectively).

As to claim 52, Fritz et al. teach an intelligent agent for searching external

corpora comprising:

search (edit) external corpora according to the parameters for content (Fig. 1

element 102 and col. 5 lines 1-4),

tag said content identified in the search (col. 6 lines 54-65; search via hyperlink),

a selectively retrieve the content (col. 6 lines 54-65 and Fig. 1 element 104).

As to claim 53, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 52 upon which claim

53 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the content includes document structures (Fig. 14 element 1408 and 1402, 1412

and 1414, col. 11 lines 16-27; structure relation concept of documents).

As to claim 54, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 52 upon which claim

54 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the content includes document models (Fig. 10; document model "Sales Order"

and fig. 17 "evaluate relation, get phys. object (model); "modeling report" file is an

information class groups all documents that should be treated in a common specific

manner, col. 11 lines 55-60).

As to claim 55, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 52 upon which claim

55 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the content includes objects (Fig. 10.2 element 1008, object such as content

repository).

As to claim 56, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 52 upon which claim

56 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the content includes concepts (content category, Fig. 10.2 element 1006; content

category, col. 8 lines 55-67; content category acts as a logical descriptor).

As to claim 57, Fritz et al. teach computer readable media tangibly embodying a

program of instructions executable by a computer to perform an enhancing of a source

corpus in a document management system comprising:

receiving inherent electronic signals (web browser, view application col. 5 lines 1-

6; inherent in computer which has electronic signals) representing parameters including

document structure (Fig. 19) and document domain (topic, element 1902) information

regarding the source corpus ("Root Physical Object", col. 12 lines 1-9);

searching external document repositories (Fig. 1 element 108) according to the

parameters to identify (attributes) and tag document domain and structure information

(Fig. 19) in the external document repositories according to the parameters (attributes,

col. 9 lines 35-45; derive new translation or version or content through editing the

content, thus searching external document according to attributes such as logical object

and tagging done in Fig. 19 of the external documents according to the class or

relation); and

reporting the tagged information for selective retrieval of the tagged information

(Fig. 13, col. 10 lines 47-65).

As to claim 58, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 57 upon which claim

58 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

analyzing the tagged information to create a heuristic model defining document

domain and document structure (Fig. 19, "structure") information as a second parameter

(Fig. 19 second parameter is element 1904); and

causing an inherent electronic signals representing the second parameter (Fig.

19 element 1902) to be reported to a document management server to update said first

parameters (first parameter is updated via the translation, col. 12 lines 10-15).

As to claim 59, Fritz et al. teach computer readable media tangibly embodying a

program of instructions executable by a computer to perform a method of managing

documents in a document management system comprising:

constructing heuristic models including a domain model and a document

structure model in a source corpus of documents (Fig. 19; modeling via predefined

relations and content, col. 11 lines 55-60 and col. 12 lines 11-18);

using the heuristic models to derive parameters for the operation of an intelligent

agent over at least one external document repository (Fig. 19 and Fig. 1 "info

repository"; col. 12 lines 5-14 and col. 11 lines 55-60; parameters such as logic objects

are structured in the IR system);

enhancing the source corpus of documents by adding selected documents using .

the intelligent agent operating under the direction of parameters derived from the

heuristic models to form an artificially enhanced corpus (Fig. 6, elements 608 and 610,

documents are added using process in Fig. 4 and Fig. 1. element 108).

As to claim 60, Fritz et al. teach a document management system, in which a

source corpus is enhanced by the use of an intelligent agent to create an artificially

enhanced corpus by a method comprising:

receiving electronic signals (web browser, view application col. 5 lines 1-6;

inherent in computer which has electronic signals) for representing a document from the

intelligent agent (Fig. 1 element 108), the document including domain (Fig. 19 element

1902) and structure information (Fig. 19 and modeling via predefined relations and

content, col. 12 lines 1-18);

performing heuristic modeling of the source corpora and the received document

(Fig. 3 element 302 and Fig. 18 element 1902, modeling language version and

language content parameters col. 12 lines 1-8 and col. 11 lines 55-60); and

sending inherent electronic signals representing search parameters (user request

to view content through a Web browser via the IR URL) derived from the modeling

(object ID) to the intelligent agent (IR) requesting another document according to the

search parameter (for displaying content, the IR offers URL from an object ID and

context, the ID can be application object that is linked to the IR object, col. 12 lines 34-

51 and col. 11 lines 55-65; col. 5 lines 1-6; electrical signals representing search

parameters are inherent in computer and monitor system).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 4-17 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Fritz et al. (6,134,552) in view of Morimoto et al. (6,789,057).

At to claim 4, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 3 upon which claim 4

depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses translation (Fig. 3 and 4).

Fritz et al. does not explicitly teach analysis of undefined terms.

However, Morimoto et al. teach performing an analysis of terms surrounding an

undefined term to translate the undefined term (unknown words, hypothesis file,

dictionary retrieval, col. 14 lines 53-67).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Fritiz's document management system with Morimoto's

dictionary retrieval to perform an analysis of terms surrounding an undefined term

because this would provide correct document translation (Morimoto, col. 2 lines 43-49).

At to claim 5 Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 4 upon which claim 5 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the analysis includes performing an inherent natural language analysis (col. 6 lines 17-24; col. 8 lines 55-67 and Fig. 4; content category would inherently perform natural language analysis in order to find out the proper category to place each document or file).

At to claim 6, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 4 upon which claim 6 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses an inherent analysis (translation, col. 6 lines 17-24).

Fritz et al. does not explicitly teach statistical analysis.

However, Morimoto et al. teach

the analysis includes a statistical analysis (unknown words, hypothesis set, syntactic analysis, col. 14 lines 45-60).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fritz's document management system with Morimoto's dictionary retrieval in order to store the proper candidate translation, as taught by Morimoto, col. 2 lines 43-49, col. 6 lines 17-24, and col. 15 lines 1-6.

At to claim 7, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 6 upon which claim 7

depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

mining the uni-corpus, wherein mining includes locating tagged objects within the

uni-corpus (Fig. 6 inherently involves data mining elements 604, 608, 610 and Fig. 3-4

tagging elements 304 and 306).

At to claim 8, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 5 upon which claim 8

depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

mining of the uni-corpus (sales Order, Fig. 10.4 and "component" in Fig. 10.1

element 1002 and Fig. 6) includes extraction of concept systems (Fig. 10.4 "content of

the content category").

At to claim 9, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 7 upon which claim 9

depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

wherein the extraction of concept systems includes inherently determining

semantic relations between individual concepts (col. 11 lines 54-67, Fig. 17, element

1704 "create relation class" between file or physical object and info class, elements

1702 and 1706, which inherently involves semantic relations.).

At to claim 10, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 5 upon which claim

10 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

replicating the uni-corpus in at least one other language to form a second uni-corpus, wherein the second uni-corpus is mined to obtain useful objects in the other language (col. 3 lines 24-37; Fig. 3, uni-corpus is element 304, other language is "language =E" and mined information is extracted in physical object in element 310, such as "component" "GIF file").

At to claim 11, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 10 upon which claim 11 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

the mining is performed selectively to assist in a task (Fig. 22 element 2212, col. 13 lines 18-22; Fig. 3; mining is performed via the task of translating from one language to another).

At to claim 12, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim 12 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

task includes authoring a document (content access agent requires user registration, col. 7 lines 30-40).

At to claim 13, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim 13 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

task includes content based searching (document view or browsing, Fig. 1 element 102 and col. 5 lines 1-7).

At to claim 14, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim

14 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

task includes document management (Fig. 1a.1 element 124 and col. 5 lines 1-6

and col. 7 lines 7-10; IR, information repository, management system).

At to claim 15, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim

15 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

task includes content management (Fig. 1 element 112, and col. 5 lines 1-6 and

col. 7 lines 7-10, IR Management System is context resolution, which inherently

involves content management of data).

At to claim 16, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim

16 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

task includes translation (Fig. 3).

At to claim 17, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 11 upon which claim

17 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

translation includes corpus based machine translation (col. 6 lines 54-57 and Fig.

1a.2 element 132 and Fig. 4; the IR document management system does the

translation, which inherently has a machine dictionary to translate words from one

language to the next).

At to claim 28, Fritz et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 27 upon which claim

28 depends on, Fritz et al. further discloses

analyzing (col. 6 lines 17-24; col. 8 lines 55-67 and Fig. 4).

Fritz et al. does not explicitly teach statistical analysis of terms adjacent to un-

translated terms.

However Morimoto et al. teach analyzing includes a statistical analysis

(hypothesis record) of terms adjacent to the un-translated terms (Fig. 19 FIFO and latch

and col. 14 lines 61-67).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Fritz's document management system with Morimoto's

dictionary retrieval because this would provide the user with correct grammar

(Morimoto, col. 2 lines 50-60, col. 6 lines 17-24, and col. 15 lines 1-6).

7.   Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritz et

al. (6,134,552) in view of Hartrick et al. (5,532,920).

As to claim 47 Fritz et al. teach a document management system operating

according to a business method comprising:

providing document management services (content access agent) including

translation and authoring services over a global information network to a customer

(content access agent , author of changing an original must go through content access

agent and register, col. 7 lines 27-56 and col. 5 lines 15-27), where the customer has a

source corpus of documents to be managed (col. 7 lines 31-36 and 60-67);

accessing the source corpus with an intelligent agent to analyze the source

corpus (Fig. 1 element 108), identify selected objects within the source corpus (Fig. 3

element 304), and tag the selected objects with a metatag (Fig. 3 element 304,

"attributes" "language" "content"), wherein the analysis results in the generation of

document parameters programmed into the intelligent agent for searching of external

document repositories (Fig. 3 element 306 via translation and format conversion in

element 310, both derived from Management Agent or intelligent agent in Fig. 1 element

108), wherein said intelligent agent uses said parameters (physical objects) to identify

and tag objects of interest in said external document repositories (Management Agent

access "Info Repository", col. 6 lines 16-21) and selectively retrieve the objects to

enhance the source corpus (Figs. 3 element 310 and col. 6 lines 25-37); and

tracking rights in said retrieved objects (col. 7 lines 40-55).

Fritz does not explicitly teach rights to determine a royalty payable to an owner of

the rights.

However, Hartrick et al. teach rights to determine a royalty payable to an owner

of the rights (the management of copying and printing operations for a softcopy

document by a data processor, so as to comply with royalty payment requirements for

making copies of the document, col. 1 lines 10-15).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Fritz's document management system with Hartrick's

soft-copying of books because this would allow users to have protection over soft-copy

ownership, thus this would ensure the enforcement or prevention of free copying.

(Hartrick, col. 2 lines 64-65).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 a.m. - 2:00p.m.

9.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10.   Information as to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).   09/06/2005   MP

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER